

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated March 20, 2009. All rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested. No amendments are made to the claims, but a clean copy of the claims are presented herein for the Examiner's convenience.

Interview Request

The undersigned again respectfully requests the courtesy of a telephone interview with the Examiner at the Examiner's earliest convenience in order to expedite prosecution and avoid the necessity of appeal. The undersigned can be reached at the telephone number below.

Response to Rejections

All claims were rejected based upon the Blatter reference in combination with the Herley reference of record. Applicant has again reviewed the Blatter reference and believes that the Patent Office has over-broadened the actual disclosure of the Blatter reference to a point of mischaracterizing the actual disclosure of the Blatter reference.

In response to the allegations in the Office Action, Applicant reiterates the prior response in regard to Blatter by reference, stands by the prior positions and turns attention to the secondary Herley reference. The Office admits that Blatter does not disclose that the same portion of the program is encrypted under a second encryption system and turns to Herley in search of such teaching. However, such teaching is totally lacking in Herley.

The Office asserts that Herley discloses a method and apparatus for partial encryption of content where the same portion of the program is encrypted two or more times and references figs. 2-5, the abstract, page 1, paragraphs [0010-0013] and [0020-0031]. Applicant wishes to note that the Herley reference is very familiar to Applicant and has been asserted by the Office in several related applications – and in each instance, the Office has abandoned a similar position as that taken in the present application. The assertion that Herley encrypts the same portion of the program two or more times is simply erroneous.

Application No.: 10/084,106

-11-

MPEP 2143.03 requires that all claim features must be considered during examination. "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). Hence, in order to establish *prima facie* obviousness, the Office must identify each element of the claims in the cited art. By erroneous interpretation of the Herley reference, the Office fails on this count and the combination fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness as follows:

The Office asserts that Herley discloses "a method and apparatus for partial encryption of content where the same portion of the program is encrypted two or more times" and references figs. 2-5, the abstract, page 1, paragraphs [0010-0013] and [0020-0031] for support for the Office's position. However, that support is not to be found.

Fig. 2 of Herley clearly indicates that the file is divided into two files and that only the second is encrypted.

Fig. 3 of Herley is quite illustrative of his process and shows that the data are split into parts 310 and 320 for transmission. Decryption is carried out to recreate the original image 300 as 340 by combining the two files.

Fig. 4 simply shows extraction of the portions of a JPEG file for placement in a second file.

Fig. 5 simply depicts transfer of data using public key encryption and decryption.

None of these figures singly or collectively disclose that which is alleged – namely that the same portion of content is encrypted two or more times or duplication.

The abstract only states that the second file is encrypted, and does not allude to encryption more than once or duplication.


Paragraphs [0010-0013] only states that the second file is encrypted and never alludes to encryption more than once or duplication.

Paragraphs [0020-0031] again only states that the second file is encrypted but allows that the original file can be divided into "multiple" files.

By way of illustration of the teachings of Herley compared to that of Applicant and Applicant's claims, consider the following. To illustrate graphically, Herley's example illustrates the following. In the figure below, the output as described in Herley is depicted as

Application No.: 10/084,106

circled "A". According to Herley, the file can be split into any number of files as shown in circled "B", and that the encryption used for the two encrypted files illustrated below could be different or the same. Herley teaches and suggests nothing beyond this and fails to teach any duplication of content for multiple encryption.



Referring now to Applicants' claims, and taking claim 1 for example, this claim calls for "at least one primary PID that identifies a portion of a program encrypted under a first encryption system to at least one shadow PID that identifies a duplicate of the same portion of the program encrypted under a second encryption system". (emphasis added) Note that Herley never duplicates and encrypts a single selected segment (e.g., B, H and N in the example above) using more than one encryption mechanism. Herley instead chooses to keep the encrypted segments in a separate file from unencrypted segments. Each currently pending claim contains similar language that recites duplicate content, and hence the present position is applicable to all claims.

Application No.: 10/084,106

In view of the failure to identify each and every claim feature and properly interpret each word of the claims, the proposed combination fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Concluding Remarks

Applicant believes that the many distinctions between Applicant's claims and the Blatter reference make it unnecessary to provide further arguments at this point. As such, failure to address each and every argument made by the Patent Office is believed unnecessary at this point. Accordingly, failure to address each and every point made by the Patent Office is not to be considered acquiescence to any such point.

In view of the discussion above, claims 1-51 are now in proper condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested and notice of allowance for all pending claims is respectfully requested at the earliest possible date.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is again earnestly requested to contact the undersigned to expedite allowance and issue and avoid the necessity and expense of appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jerry A. Miller 30779/
Jerry A. Miller
Registration No. 30,779

Dated: 5/28/2009

Please Send Correspondence to:
Jerry A. Miller
Miller Patent Services
2500 Dockery Lane
Raleigh, NC 27606
Phone: (919) 816-9981
Fax: (919) 816-9982
Customer Number 24337

Application No.: 10/084,106